

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.111  
Serial No. 10/783,035  
Attorney Docket No. 042127

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the original sheet of drawings with Fig. 1 by the attached replacement sheet with Fig. 1 and new Fig. 2.

REMARKS

By the present amendment, a new Figure 2 has been added, and the specification has been amended accordingly to introduce Fig. 2. Support for Fig. 2 and the corresponding description is found in the original application, in particular on page 31, lines 22-25.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the optical film comprises a polarizing plate and at least an end face of the polarizing plate is covered with a water-repellent material having a thickness of from 0.001 to 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$ . Accordingly, claim 2 has been cancelled.

Also, new claim 9 dependent on claim 1 has been added to recite that the thickness of the water-repellant material is from 0.001 to 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$ , and new claims 10-11 dependent on claims 1 and 9, respectively, have been added to recite that the water-repellant material covers an end face but not main faces of the polarizing plate.

Support for the amendments is found in the original application, in particular in original claim 2, on page 10, line 2 of the specification, and Figure 1.

Claims 1 and 3-11 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 1, and claims 3-4 and 9-11 depending directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to an optical member. Claim 5 is directed to a method for producing the optical member according to claim 1. Claim 6 is directed to an adhesive optical member comprising the optical member of claim 1. Claims 7 and 8 are directed to an image viewing display using the optical member of claims 1 and 6, respectively.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to as lacking an image viewing display.

A new Fig. 2 has been added to represent schematically an image viewing display with a liquid crystal cell and a backlight. It is submitted that the new Fig. 2 does not add any new matter. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1, 4, and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by JP 2002-313140 ("Mitsui"), and claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mitsui.

Present claim 1 includes the subject matter of original claim 2 which is not included in this rejection. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejections over Mitsui are moot.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections over Mitsui should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by JP 60-083903 ("Hitachi"). It is alleged in the Office Action that the polarizing film 2 of Hitachi has an end surface coated with epoxy, and that this material is inherently water repellent.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Present claim 1 recites that the water-repellant material covering the end-face of the polarizing plate has a thickness of from 0.001 to 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$ . In contrast, the epoxy sealing layer of Hitachi has generally a thickness in the range of from 0.5 to 1 mm. In other words, the thickness of the sealing layer of Hitachi is at least 1000 times thicker than the water-repellent layer of the present invention.

In addition, with respect to present claims 10-11, Hitachi the sealing layer of Hitachi is formed to cover the peripheral portion of the faces of the optical film of Hitachi, as clearly visible

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.111  
Serial No. 10/783,035  
Attorney Docket No. 042127

in the Figures of Hitachi. Thus, Hitachi is completely silent as to the water-repellant material covering an end face but not main faces of the polarizing plate, as recited in present claims 10-11. Therefore, for this reason alone, present claims 10-11 are not obvious over Hitachi.

Also, with respect to the other dependent claims, the combinations of features recited in these respective claims are not taught or suggested in Hitachi. Therefore, for these respective reasons alone, these claims are not obvious over Hitachi.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections over Hitachi should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.111  
Serial No. 10/783,035  
Attorney Docket No. 042127

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,373

**Atty. Docket No. 042127**  
**Customer No.: 38834**  
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 822-1100  
Fax: (202) 822-1111  
NES:rep